



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

B

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,996	11/13/2003	Johannes J. Platteeuw	SYN-0053	6523
38427	7590	03/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MARK R. BUSCHER SYNTTHON IP INC 7130 HERITAGE VILLAGE PLAZA STE 202 GAINESVILLE, VA 20155			GEORGE, KONATA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
				DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/705,996	PLATTEEUW, JOHANNES J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Konata M. George	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/18/04; 8/25/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 18 and 25, 2004 was noted and the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner has considered the information disclosure statement.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-36 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of

copending Application No. 10/293,940. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending applications are directed towards a dosage form comprising a plurality of pellets having a pellet core comprising tamsulosin hydrochloride, a carrier (microcrystalline cellulose), release control agent (water-permeable acrylic polymer) and an outer coating layer and having a similar dissolution release profile. The difference between the copending applications is the particle diameter, the concentration of the outer layer coating and the release rate. The instant application comprises ranges, which are broader than the copending applications. In the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. .

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukui et al. (US 4,772,475) in view of Mulye (US 6,475,493) and Thompson et al. (US 6,177,430).

Art Unit: 1616

Fukui et al discloses a pharmaceutical controlled release formulation comprising adding a release-controlling agent to a mixture of a physiologically active substance and units-forming substances (abstract). The active substance that is preferred is (5-{2-[2-(o-ethoxyphenoxy)ethylamino]propyl}-2-methoxybenzenesulfonamide hydrochloride (tamsulosin hydrochloride), the units-forming substance can be a crystalline cellulose, chitin or chitosan and a release-controlling agent (col. 2, lines 16-68). Column 3, line 41 teaches the concentration of the release-controlling agent. Column 4, lines 44-45 teach that the granular products have particles sizes of 0.1 to 1.5 mm. The prior art does not teach the process of making the granules, the process of making, the physical characteristics of the product, or treating prostatic hyperplasia.

Mulye discloses a controlled release pharmaceutical formulation wherein the core elements are enterically coated with Eudrgit L polymer, a method of treating diseases and a method of coating and drying in a fluidized bed in addition to the relative amounts of ingredients in the composition.

Thompson et al. discloses a method of preventing further hyperplasia in humans by administering drugs such as tamsulosin in tablets (abstract, col. 2, lines 55-65 and col. 3, line 50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare a pharmaceutical composition comprising pellets or granules of tamsulosin in a controlled release form with the method of Mulye. One of ordinary skill would expect to obtain a controlled release formulation of tamsulosin and a method of treating prostatic hyperplasia (Thompson et al.) while taking advantage of the relative amounts of weight

percent and other limitations disclosed in Mulye. Furthermore, Mulye suggests that selecting a release-controlling agent and/or other controlling agents can control the release of the active substance.

Conclusion

4. Claims 1-36 are rejected.

Telephone Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Konata M. George, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0613. The examiner can normally be reached from 8AM to 6:30PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (571) 272-0887. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8000 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Konata M. George



JOHN PAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 160